

LORD CRANBORNE

Great-grandparents.

1. James, 2nd Marquess of Salisbury, related on his mother's side to the 1st Duke of Wellington; father of Robert, 3rd Marquess of Salisbury, Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary; grandfather of Arthur, 1st Earl Balfour, Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary and of several other notable members of the Cecil and Balfour families.

2. Frances, daughter of Bamber Gascoigne of a well-known commercial family; her great-grandfather was Lord Mayor of London, her uncle a general.

3. Sir Edward Alderson, Senior Wrangler and subsequently a judge, 1st cousin of Sir James Alderson, President of the College of Physicians, and of Amelia, Mrs. Opie, poet and novelist.

4. Georgina, daughter of Rev. Edward Drewe, related on her mother's side to the later generations of the Darwin and Wedgwood families.

5. Philip Gore, 4th Earl of Anan, uncle of Charles Gore, Bishop of Oxford, and of Spencer Gore, first lawn tennis champion.

6. Elizabeth, daughter of Gen. Sir William Napier, historian, niece of Gen. Sir Charles and Gen. Sir George Napier and of Henry Napier, historian.

7. Robert, Viscount Jocelyn, uncle of Roden Noel, poet.

8. Frances, daughter of the 5th Earl Cowper, niece of Lord Melbourne, Prime Minister.

The positive eugenic value of the above ascents needs no elaboration.

W. T. J. GUN.

Jews and Nordics

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I write, not as a Jew, but as the descendant of members of the East Anglian peasantry for as far back as I can follow. Most members of my family would be taken for text-book anthropological specimens of the Nordic type. Certainly we are all much more Nordic in appearance than say Herr Hitler, Herr Goebbels and ex-Captain Goering. Therefore I will not be suspected of any subjective bias when I assure Mr. Thompson (January 1936, page 351) that his thinly veiled attempt to stir up anti-Semitism under the pretence of eugenic policy appertains to the dark ages of barbarism and not to objective biological science.

It is certainly true that Professor Ruggles Gates and others have pointed to certain cases where hybridization of widely differing sub-races has been attended with the production of biological disharmony. This is exactly what one would expect on Mendelian principles. Segregation of a great number of differing genetic factors inevitably means that in some cases the inferior ones will gather together. Where both intermingling stocks are on the whole inferior, the incidence of biological

disharmony is greatest. But the converse is also true. The best genetic factors appertaining to each race may segregate out together. The result may be hybrids better than either parent stock. This in fact seems the only explanation of the remarkable fact noted by such competent thinkers as Havelock Ellis and Kretschmer—viz. that the areas of greatest racial admixture, e.g. East Anglia, Swabia and the Netherlands, are also the districts providing the highest proportion of men of eminence or genius.

As to the Jewish race, I am not prejudiced. I do not like Jewish peddlers nor certain types of Jewish physiognomy. But simple justice compels me to declare that no other race under the sun exhibits so glorious a record of religious, philosophical, scientific and artistic genius. Witness the illustrious roll of fame from Maimonides to Einstein, witness the record of Jews in the country which now so foully persecutes them, where they contributed no less than ten times their expected proportion to the roll of Nobel prize-winners. I defy Mr. Thompson to produce one tittle of evidence to show that Nordic-Semitic crosses have produced more inferior than superior types. Admitted that such crossings have been attended with lamentable consequences. But that is the fault of the enemies of humanity and justice who tear the wife from the husband, the children from the parents, and by a calculated and deliberate policy, seek to starve a whole population, of the same race as Jesus and Mary, out of existence. I challenge Mr. Thompson to produce any scientific basis whatsoever for the wild assertions he has made. I warn him that in seeking to controvert my challenge it is no good going to such authorities as the alleged protocols of the Elders of Zion nor to the perverted anthropology which, not much more accurate, rules in Germany to-day. Mr. Thompson is too far from England to realize, what every decent Englishman thinks to-day, that anti-Semitism is an offence against every principle of justice and decency which the true traditions of this country uphold.

The above largely replies to Mr. Goethe (January 1936, page 351). When such contemptible doctrines as these are associated with the word of Nordic, is it any wonder that every fair-minded individual is disposed to throw it out of the window. For myself, if anyone calls me a Jew, I will not trouble to correct the misnomer. But if anyone really wants to insult me, perhaps the best way he can do so is to call me Nordic.

HERBERT BREWER.

Maldon, Essex.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—The letters in the January 1936 number from Mr. Norman A. Thompson and Mr. C. M. Goethe represent not only unscientific biology but worse sociology. The former is worried about the disastrous biological effects of racial crosses between Jews and Germanic stocks. There is no

scientific evidence whatever that such matings are biologically unwise. It is true that sometimes they may be socially inadvisable where there are great differences of cultural background or for other social reasons. It would be most unfortunate, therefore, if the Council of the *Eugenics Society* followed the advice of Mr. Thompson and sent a circular letter to the responsible heads of schools and colleges urging the indoctrination of pupils against racial crosses on biological grounds. There is, surely, no more certain way to bring eugenics into disrepute among thoughtful and informed people.

Your other correspondent, Mr. C. M. Goethe, is likewise misled by his Nordic myth. He speaks of the "tragic blunder of accepting the melting-pot philosophy" in the United States. He alleges that the Immigration Quota Acts of 1921-4 "frankly accepted the desirability of Nordic homogeneity." If so, it was or should have been on social and not biological grounds. There are strong social grounds for the desire of any country to maintain its cultural continuity and integrity without the introduction of social and disruptive forces in the form of a *too rapid* rate of immigration. The restriction can be justified on economic grounds to protect the American standard of living and on the social grounds mentioned, since the culture of the countries of northern and western Europe has been, until recently, at least, more similar to ours than the culture of southern and eastern Europe. But that even this similarity may be ephemeral recent events suggest.

I have always been an advocate of intelligent selection and restriction of immigration into the United States on economic and social grounds. But I think we merely confuse issues and bring sound eugenics into disrespect by using bad arguments for a good case.

NORMAN E. HIMES.

Colgate University,
Hamilton, New York.

The Decline in Population.

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—In your January issue, on page 272, you quote from Mr. Geoffrey Crowther some assertions which you seem to approve. To me, on the contrary, they seem absurd. Let us take them in detail.

1. "Nothing whatever that we can do from now on can prevent the population of Great Britain falling quite considerably in the latter part of this century."

If it were desirable to avert such a fall, we could easily do so by admitting immigrants. As our standard of life is higher than that of any Continental country, immigrants would pour in if we allowed them.

I hope, however, that we shall do nothing to prevent a considerable fall of population. Apart

from economic reasons, our danger in war would be appalling if we were caught with our present population. With thousands of aeroplanes on the watch, it would be almost impossible for a single food ship to reach our shores. It is better to cut down our numbers by birth-control than by eating one another.

2. "If the average size of the family continues to fall in future, as it has been falling for nearly a hundred years, the population in 2036 will only be a tiny fraction of what it is in 1936."

"If" that should happen the result is of course obvious. In sixty years the size of the family has fallen from 4.5 to 2. A further equal fall would extinguish the family. It is hardly likely, however, that because two children are now considered a sufficient family, the people sixty years hence will prefer to have none at all.

3. "Even if the average size of the family does not fall any further, the population of these islands will disappear within a couple of centuries. This must be so, because the generations are not reproducing themselves."

That would have seemed a most extraordinary piece of reasoning in the days when I was a student of logic. I can understand why an average of two children per marriage is not enough to prevent the population diminishing, for some will always die in childhood, and some will not marry; but I cannot understand why it should cause the population to disappear in two centuries.

4. "If we are to save the population from disappearance, the size of the average family must be increased quite considerably. Nobody knows how to do this. If we can do it at all, it will be enormously expensive."

The above statement is an extreme exaggeration. If all healthy women who desire motherhood were allowed to have it, the present average of two to a family need not be greatly exceeded. About 85 per cent. of female infants now reach maturity. If all adult women averaged 2.4 children apiece, the population could never diminish, even if average longevity did not increase. If we assume that 10 per cent. of women are unfit for motherhood, an average of 2.7 would still keep the population stationary.

We must remember that natural selection always works in favour of prolificness. Those who hate, fear or are unfit for motherhood, soon eliminate themselves and their type. The fertile and philoprogenitive beget numbers who perpetuate their type. Thus natural selection will inevitably raise the birth-rate quite as soon as there is any need. The danger is that it will come too soon.

Meanwhile in many countries war is being openly advocated to relieve pressure of population. Men like Mussolini, Hitler and Goering have talked that way for years. In the *Daily Telegraph* for February 17th we are informed that "Poland's population is increasing by 500,000 a year, and it is repeatedly pointed out that they have nowhere to go." That